

# NOMINATION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL DELL LEE DAILEY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the confirmation of Lieutenant General Dell Lee Dailey as the Coordinator in the State Department's Office of Counterterrorism.

Lieutenant General Dailey has had a distinguished military career. There can be no question about that. He is a graduate of West Point and has served as a battalion commander, regiment commander, and assistant division commander both at posts in the United States and abroad. Most recently, he served as director at the Center for Special Operations at MacDill Air Force Base. He has received numerous awards for his excellence including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, two Defense Superior Service Medals, three Army Commendation Medals and six Meritorious Service Medals. He has spent his entire life defending this nation and I thank him for service.

The position to which he was confirmed last Friday is that of the State Department's Coordinator for the Office of Counterterrorism. While I did not object to Lieutenant General Dailey's confirmation, as a member of both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence, I would like to register my concerns.

While the nomination of a military official to a civilian post does not by itself cause concerns, this particular position requires an ability to develop and implement interagency strategies and to encourage the use of and mobilize non-DOD assets. In the context of this administration's tendency to employ military options against strategic problems, or to assign nonmilitary functions to the Department of Defense, it is particularly important that the Coordinator for Counterterrorism demonstrate a commitment to expanding and utilizing the resources of the State Department, USAID and other agencies of the U.S. Government.

I have talked with General Dailey and reviewed his writings, including a 2006 article in which he wrote that Special Operations forces, "doing what they do best," are "developing links within the population that will provide ongoing intelligence and personal relationships that will cement ties with allies around the world." When it comes to military engagements, Special Operations forces may, in fact, have this role. But in most of the countries and regions of the world where we are fighting al-Qaida and seeking to deny it safe haven, these activities should not fall to the Department of Defense. Indeed, "developing links within the population" and "cement[ing] ties with allies around the world" are the jobs of our diplomats. And, in far-flung regions of the world, where a U.S. diplomatic presence or foreign aid program can help deny terrorist organizations safe haven, we should be working to expand those efforts, not deferring to the Department of Defense. This is critical

for four reasons. First, our diplomats and foreign assistance professionals have the background and training to conduct these activities. Second, regardless of the skills of Special Operations forces, the very fact that uniformed officers are at the forefront of local diplomacy can be counterproductive by encouraging or reinforcing perceptions that U.S. policy is driven by our military. Third, if policy is to guide counterterrorism efforts—and that is the whole point of the Coordinator position—then diplomats, not soldiers, need to be leading the way. And, finally, we need our military to do what it does best in the struggle against al-Qaida and its allies, and that is conduct tactical operations as well as work directly with host country militaries and regional peacekeeping forces. The overextension of Special Operations or other military forces for other missions takes away from these efforts.

We need only look at Africa, where strategic counterterrorism policies are desperately needed, to understand the challenges ahead. In Somalia, DOD operations have been conducted in a near policy vacuum. Tactical efforts have not, and will not, address the conditions that have allowed terrorist organizations safe haven. Yet violence and instability continue to fester, at great cost to our national security, without adequate diplomatic, humanitarian or foreign assistance efforts. Elsewhere on the continent, in regions where extremism can take hold and where terrorist organizations might find sympathetic populations, neither the State Department nor USAID has sought to maintain a presence. Finally, AFRICOM's recent difficulties in finding a willing host country illustrate how diplomatic initiatives must precede efforts to expand our military footprint. I have supported AFRICOM and believe that African nations will recognize what the command may have to offer, but we must acknowledge that governments and local populations alike remain skeptical of initiatives that seem driven by our military.

It is in this context that I sought from General Dailey an understanding of this critical position, one whose primary mission is "to forge partnerships with non-state actors, multilateral organizations, and foreign governments to advance the counterterrorism objectives and national security of the United States." At his nomination hearing, I asked him the following question:

What points of collaboration do you see for the relative roles of U.S. military action, military assistance and nonmilitary assistance in the war against international terrorism?

Lieutenant General Dailey's response was:

The military has a huge source of non-lethal, non-kinetic resources that Department of State and the other agencies, I think, can rely on to be successful in that portion of the war on terror that gets to the hearts and

minds of the people. Civil affairs operations, public diplomacy—right now the Special Operations organizations have about 15 or 20 teams that help in public diplomacy that work specifically for the ambassadors in the embassies. That's just a small snapshot of what the military can bring to the table.

Unfortunately, this response appears to reflect the mindset of someone who sees combating terrorism through a military, or at least Department of Defense, prism. This answer suggests a lack of appreciation for the need to incorporate and balance civil, intelligence, and military initiatives when coordinating a U.S. counterterrorism strategy. It is not that the answer is wrong; it indicates a keen understanding of what the Department of Defense can bring to the table. But the Department of Defense does not need more champions in the interagency process. What is needed is a champion for the role of other agencies and departments, for aggressive diplomacy, for expanded foreign assistance efforts, for antipoverty and anticorruption programs that complement broader counterterrorism strategies, for effective public diplomacy, and for multilateral cooperation, including strengthening regional organizations in places like Africa and rediscovering the common ground with our allies in Europe and elsewhere that we had immediately after September 11.

I recognize that these challenges present an extremely high bar for any nominee. I also recognize that this nomination is colored by the failure of this administration to develop and implement effective interagency counterterrorism strategies. But it is precisely because of the critical importance of this position and the need for the nominee to resist this administration's overemphasis on military options that I have regarded General Dailey's nomination with such scrutiny. I do not register these concerns lightly and now that he has been confirmed, I look forward to working with General Dailey on developing coherent and comprehensive counterterrorism strategies, coordinating true interagency efforts and promoting the use of our diplomatic and other nonmilitary resources that are so critical to success in the fight against al-Qaida and its affiliates.

## REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senator Craig Thomas was a very good friend. He served in the Senate with great honor and respect for the institution.

I got to know Senator Thomas best through the work of the Finance Committee. Senator Thomas was an active and dedicated participant in the business of the committee from tax policy, to health care, Social Security and international trade. When I was chairman of the committee, I could always count on his diligent, steadfast and